

TOLEDO, OH 43604-1853

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 10/631,129 07/31/2003 10541-1667 2478 Bryan Youngpeter **EXAMINER** 57444 7590 09/25/2006 AUTOMOTIVE COMPONENTS HOLDINGS LLC FREAY, CHARLES GRANT C/O MACMILLAN, SOBANSKI & TODD, LLC ART UNIT PAPER NUMBEK ONE MARITIME PLAZA, FIFTH FLOOR 720 WATER STREET 3746

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/631,129	YOUNGPETER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Charles G. Freay	3746
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the flow control valve being a rotary valve must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification at paragraph [0020] sets forth that the flow control valve may be a rotary valve. This is not a complete disclosure of how such a valve would be implemented including the location, sizing and shapes of the various openings, both within the valve element and the bore. While the rotary actuation of the valve can be clearly understood it is not clear how the details of the device would be implemented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kohler et al (USPN 5,125,807).

Kohler discloses a pump having a housing (5) defining an axial bore within which a flow control valve (3) slides. There is a fluid discharge port (into 26) and a fluid bypass port (15) communicating with the bore at first and second axial locations. There is also an electrical means (7) for sliding the flow control valve. As shown in Fig. 3 there is a spring (36) for biasing the flow control valve.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakayoshi (USPN 5,713,726).

Nakayoshi discloses a pump having a housing (4) defining an axial bore within which a flow control valve (219, 230) slides. There is a fluid discharge port (5,42) and a fluid bypass port (3,41) communicating with the bore at first and second axial locations. There is also an electrical means (223) for sliding the flow control valve, there is also a spring (226) for biasing the flow control valve.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimura et al (USPN 5,860,797) in view of Yokota et al (USPN 6,041,883).

Fujimura et al disclose a housing (1) defining a axial bore (23) within which a flow control valve (14) slides. There is a fluid discharge port (18a) and a fluid bypass port (1a) communicating with the bore at first and second axial locations. The bore comprises a first bore end and a second bore end and a pump outlet passage communicating with the bore at the first end (clearly shown in Fig. 3). A sleeve (18) is secure at the second bore end, there is a spring biasing means (17). Further there are pumping elements in the form of a rotor (5) in a cam chamber (12), the rotor having retractable vanes (11). Fujimura et al do not disclose an electrical means for sliding the flow control valve. Yokota et al disclose a flow control valve (14) which is actuated by an electrical means (4) to slide axially within the bore. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fujimura et al by replacing the hydraulic actuation with an electrical means such as taught by Yokota et al to regulate the flow of fluid to the fluid bypass port as a means of electronically controlling the valve is response to turning maneuvers of a vehicle, using the steering angle to calibrate minimum or maximum flow requirements (col. 8 lines 45-50).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10-14 of copending Application No. 10/631363 ('363). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of the claims of the instant application are recited in the claims of the ('363) application. The claims of ('363) also set forth additional limitations. Thus the claims of the instant invention are broader than the claims of ('363) and one of ordinary skill making the invention disclosed in the ('363) application would also be infringing upon the claims of the instant invention in the event that both applications issued.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Konishi discloses a similar rotary vane power steering pump.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles G. Freay whose telephone number is 571-272-4827. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Thorpe can be reached on 571-272-4444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ይNåfles ଓ Freay ໍ(Primary Examiner Art Unit 3746

CGF September 17, 2006